REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-5, 8-18, 21-32, 35-46, 49-56 and 59-79 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 14, 27, 41 and 55 are independent claims. Claim 41 has been currently amended. Claims 75-79 are newly added claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 1-5, 8-18, 21-32, 35-46, 49-56, 59, 61-62, 64-65, 67-68, 70-71 and 73-74 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malik et al. ("Malik", U.S. Patent Number 6,023,701) in view of Brown et al. ("Brown-1", U.S. Patent Number 6,356,908) and Brown et al. ("Brown-2", U.S. Patent Number 6,278,448). Claims 60, 63, 66, 69, and 72 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malik in view of Brown-1 and Brown-2 and further in view of Gennaro et al. ("Gennaro", U.S. Patent Number 5,742,768). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

"To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations." (emphasis added) (MPEP § 2143). If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Independent Claim 1 has an element of "generating a representation of said linked second site" (emphasis added). In rejecting Claim 1, the Patent Office indicated that Malik "teaches ... generating and communicating a listing of hyperlinks of linked sites for presentation to the user (col. 2, lines 27-40)" (emphasis added) (Office Action, page 2). Thus, the Patent Office has analogized a hyperlink itself to "representation" as claimed in Claim 1. This is confirmed by "[a]lthough Ma[l]ik's hyperlinks of linked sites already contain information about the linked sites (i.e., labels or titles of the hyperlinks, e.g., www.ucberkley.edu or www.washingtonpost.com) that are informative enough to users so that such a

representation of information are interpretable to be previews of the linked sites" (emphasis added) (Office Action, pages 2-3). Applicant respectfully disagrees with this analogy.

The "representation of said linked second site" element as claimed in Claim 1 is a representation separate from the hyperlink to the linked second site. That is, the "representation" element as claimed in Claim 1 cannot be the hyperlink itself as indicated by the Patent Office. This is supported throughout the specification of the present application. For example, "[r]eferring now to FIG. 1 ... A user may access a site 10 containing a link 20 to another site 30, such as a web site or page. To preview the linked site 30, a representation 22 of the linked site 30 may be generated and communicated to a user in the display of the site 10, in this example displayed proximally to the link 20" (emphasis added) (Specification, page 5, lines 12-20). As shown in FIG. 1 of the present application, the representation 22 of the linked site 30 is clearly separate from the link 20 and cannot be the link 20 itself. In addition, "[a]s shown in FIG. 3, representations may be generated by identifying descriptive information contained in the link, linked site tag, etc. For example, if a weather link 342 was identified, a weather representation 332 may be displayed" (emphasis added) (Specification, page 7, lines 16-19). As shown in FIG. 3 of the present application, the weather representation 332 is clearly separate from the weather link 342 and cannot be the weather link 342 itself.

Thus, since Malik (and thus Malik in view of Brown-1 and Brown-2) fails to teach, disclose or suggest the element of "generating a representation of said linked second site" as claimed in Claim 1, the Patent Office has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for Claim 1. Claim 1 therefore should be allowed.

Independent Claims 14, 27, 41 and 55 are similar in scope to Claim 1 and therefore should be allowed under similar rationale as applied to Claim 1.

Dependent Claims 2-5, 8-13, 60-62 and 75; 15-18, 21-26, 63-65 and 76; 28-32, 35-40, 66-68 and 77; 42-46, 49-54, 69-71 and 78; and 56, 59, 72-74 and 79 depend from independent Claims 1, 14, 27, 41, and 55, respectively, and therefore should be allowed.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in the case.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of
Gateway, Inc.,

Dated: June 11, 2003

By: _____
Peng Zhu
Reg. No. 48,063

SUITER • WEST PC LLO
14301 FNB Parkway, Suite 220
Omaha, NE 68154
(402) 496-0300 telephone
(402) 496-0333 facsimile